

II. REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests an Interview.

In the Notice dated 04/07/2011, the Examiner contends that the filing of 3/24/2011 was incomplete.

In response, Applicant is submitting this supplemental response, along with an amendment.

In the Office Action of 7/20/2011, claim 18 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, second paragraph.

In response, Applicant is amending claim 18.

In the Office Action of 7/20/2011, claims 16, 108, 114, 118, and 125, 126, 127, and 149 have been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103. The Examiner contends that these claims are obvious in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,165,213 (Busey) and 5,862,333 *Walker*. The Notice properly identifies the Walker patent as 5,862,333.

In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed. First, the Examiner errors in finding in the Office Action, at page 7, that Walker teaches associating said first and second users with a first realm and a second realm respectively. Walker states “The online service, however, acts **only** as the interface for the present invention” (bolding added) Col. 27, lines 7-8. There is no disclosure of the claimed associating said first and second users with a first realm and a second realm respectively in connection with the claim as a whole.

Further, in the Office Action, at page 7, the Examiner finds that Busey discloses a “chat server capable of connecting clients of different protocols including Telnet and IRC” and cites to Col. 5, lines 11-14. This is not what Busey discloses, however. Instead Busey states

“Chat server 114 is capable of executing multiple server processes, such as an HTTP server process, a Telnet/chat server process, an FTP server process, an internet Relay Chat (“IIRC”) sever process, Gopher, Usenet, and WAIS”.

The fact that a server is capable of executing multiple processes is not a disclosure of “connecting clients of different protocols”, but rather a disclosure of one process supporting communication among clients of one protocol and in another process, supporting communication in supporting communication among clients of another protocol. Nothing in Walker shows communicating from one protocol to another.

Further, the Examiner has parsed claim snippets together without considering the claim as a whole.

Therefore, the cited art does not teach, in claim 16, associating said first and second users with a first realm and a second realm respectively, each said realm being accessible via the Internet using a protocol characteristic to said realm, each said user getting access to the Internet via one of a respective first and second device, at least one of said first and second devices having a storage media storing the protocol characteristic of the other realm in connection with the claim as a whole.

The rejections or claims 108, 114, 118, and 125, 126, 127, and 149 are on the same ground as that for claim 16, and are traversed on the above-provided response regarding claim 16.

APPLICANT CLAIMS LARGE ENTITY STATUS. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-0235.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 7, 2011

P.O. Box 7131
Chicago, Illinois 60680-7131
(312) 240-0824

Peter K. Trzyna
(Reg. No. 32,601)
(Customer No. 28710)